



CRC Feedback Survey

California Citizens Redistricting Commission

WeDrawTheLinesCA.org




CRC Feedback Survey

Total Responses: 334

Representative to an organization/group: 57

Individual: 252

Did not respond: 25



How was the survey distributed

- Survey was sent to CRC email list (over 14K)
 - Original email on 1-24-22 with 27% open rate
 - Reminder email on 2-1-22 with 31% open rate
- Distributed and promoted via email by CRC staff and Commissioners
- Posted on CRC social media:
 - **Instagram:** Reached 155 accounts and had a total of 20 interactions
 - **Twitter:** 5 likes, 10 retweet, 52 engagements, 12 link clicks, and 2,110 impressions
 - **Facebook:** Reached 497 and had 39 interactions



What County are you from?


LOS ANGELES	62
SAN DIEGO	33
ORANGE COUNTY	31
RIVERSIDE	20
SAN BERNARDINO	19
SACRAMENTO	19
ALAMEDA	19
CONTRA COSTA	12
STANISLAUS	11
MONTEREY	9
FRESNO	9
Empty	9
VENTURA	8
KERN	8
HUMBOLDT	8
SAN LUIS OBISPO	7
EL DORADO	7

YOLO	6
SANTA CLARA	6
SANTA CRUZ	5
SAN JOAQUIN	5
MARIN	5
SONOMA	4
SOLANO	4
SAN FRANCISCO	4
NEVADA	4
BUTTE	4
TULARE	3
MENDOCINO	3
TRINITY	2
SISKIYOU	2
SAN MATEO	2
KINGS	2
YUBA	1

SUTTER	1
SIERRA	1
SANTA BARBARA	1
SAN BENITO	1
MONO	1
MERCED	1
MARIPOSA	1
IMPERIAL	1
DEL NORTE	1
CALAVERAS	1
AMADOR	1
Total	364


Received responses from 44 out of 58 Counties

How did you first hear about the 2020 Commission?



Other Included: applicant for Commission, participated in Census, participated in 2010, High School/Teacher, local political club. **Respondents were limited to a single response.**


How Did You Stay Informed?



Other included: email, CRC livestream, local club, and a combination of some of the choices above. **Respondents could select multiple answers.**



How Did You Participate?




Other included: spoke on panels, tabling, walking precincts, applied to be a Commissioner, distributed public comment for a particular area as a part of education & observed the process.

Respondents could select multiple answers.



What Worked Well about the Statewide Redistricting Process?



This question had an open-ended response. Responses were grouped together by common themes listed above.



Details: What Worked Well about the Statewide Redistricting Process?

Additional details below are from survey respondents:

Followed Criteria/Got it done

- Deadlines were met
- Maps were completed.
- Non-partisan and impartial

Public well informed:

- Frequent communication
- Information updated regularly
- Clear instructions on how to participate
- Information widely available in multiple places: zoom, social media, radio etc.

Transparent and accessible

- The whole process being transparent
- Liked the option to participate remotely
- Language access, interpreter, translations
- Watching the meetings online

N/A

- Comment not related to statewide redistricting

Website/Social Media/Communications

- Website was easy to use & well organized
- Helpful to have everything together in one place including public input to review.
- Ongoing email communications and newsletters were very helpful
- Easy to submit comments through the website

Responsive to public input

- Felt heard by the Commission
- Commission made effort to solicit public input and made it easy for the public to participate


Good outreach

- Liked outreach presentations
- Staff were responsive

Multiple options for public input

- Good meeting times
- Appointments for public input and public presentations
- Various ways to submit input

What Could Have Worked Better & Recommendations for 2030?



This question had an open-ended response. Responses were grouped together by common themes listed above.

Details: What Could Have Worked Better & Recommendations for 2030?

Additional details below are from survey respondents:

Improve/broaden/more time for public education/outreach/communications:

- Emphasis on equity and marginalized communities.
- More updates on schedule and times to participate
- Broaden outreach to additional sectors and start earlier
- More education on process

Improve options/technology to submit and review public input:

-Submitting Input:

- More meetings and longer time to provide testimony.
- Review timeline for input, ie gathering input at the beginning instead of throughout the process and reviewing three-day period at end of process.
- Restructure process for input during meetings reducing long waits and providing information to callers that they are in the queue and what caller they are.
- Continue with online options that make the process more accessible.
- Improve mapping tools
- Explore different approaches to gathering input, ie sending a survey to all Californians. Who the commission is gathering input from – individuals vs organizations

-Reviewing Input:

- Analytical tools/data staff to help process all the input.
- Helpful for public to know how input was evaluated by commissioners - was certain input weighed more than others.
- Group input by geographic areas
- Process to weed out comments intended to favor or discriminate against an incumbent, candidate, or political party.

Details: What Could Have Worked Better & Recommendations for 2030?

Additional details below are from survey respondents:

Map viewer & PDFs:

- Better readability
- Better labeling of cities/counties, new lines vs current lines
- Was not clear what region the Commission is discussing on particular day based on postings
- Hard to see where particular city ended up in map viewer
- Better naming convention for district names that are easier to understand

Commission should be more representative of CA:

- More Racial, Economic and Geographic diversity. Comments notes some geographies not represented, including rural areas.
- Political party – i.e. accurately reflecting breakdown of CA voters
- Helpful for Commissioners to have first-hand knowledge of California geography

Timeline/time management:

- Revisit timeline and allow for more time for line drawing
- Increase time between when maps are posted and discussed
- Less live line drawing vs more presentation of work done offline
- Don't allow last minute changes
- Hard to follow along if not watching all meetings

Did not like process/outcome:

- Did not like their district
- Did not like the process/criteria

N/A:

- Comment not related to statewide redistricting



Summary: What else would you like to share with the Commission? ¹³

Approximately 60% of respondents answered this question. The responses included the following topics:

- Thanking the Commission for their work and a job well done – 30%
- Dislike of the maps/process – 53%
- Additional feedback or unrelated comments – 17%

Additional comments not addressed in previous responses included:

- Recommending the Commission have more time in the future
- Recommending the Commission have more members
- Recommending the Commission continue to focus on accessibility, like it did.
- Revisit public input appointment structure to reduce confusion and allow more participation by individuals

This was an open-ended question.

